

**ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD
2860 SOUTHWEST DR., SEDONA, AZ
MARCH 18, 2004
MINUTES**

Board Members Present:

Elizabeth Stewart, Vice Chairman
William Porter
Gabriel Gonzales-Beechum
William Cordasco
Mark Winkleman (arrived at 11:40 a.m.)

Board Members Absent:

Suzanne Pfister
John Hays

Staff Present:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks
Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships and External Affairs
Mark Siegwarth, Assistant Director, Administration
Cristie Statler, Consultant, Fundraising and Friends
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary
Jean Emery, Chief, Resources Management
Janet Hawks, Chief of Parks
Ray Warriner
Amy Hartle, Administrative Assistant
Keith Ayotte, Central Region Manager
Max Castillo, Park Manager, Verde River Greenway State Park
Sheila Stubler, Park Manager, Ft. Verde State Historic Park
Mike Rowlands,
Steve Pace, Park Manager, Slide Rock State Park

Attorney General's Office:

Joy Hernbrode, Assistant Attorney General
Patty Boland, Assistant Attorney General

A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Vice Chairman Stewart called the meeting to order at 10:27 a.m. She noted that Chairman Hays was absent from the meeting and that she would be acting as Chairman for this meeting.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that Ms. Janice Chilton, the Governor's new appointee to the Parks Board (to replace Ms. Pfister), was present. Ms. Chilton is awaiting confirmation from the State Senate.

B. INTRODUCTIONS

The Board, Staff, and guests who wished to do so introduced themselves.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment at this time.

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. **Approve Minutes of January 15, 2004 State Parks Board Meeting**
2. **Consider Grant Award Adjustments to Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #640302 for the Arizona Humanities Council Ellis-Shackelford Rehabilitation Project** – Staff recommends increasing the grant award for Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #640302 for the Arizona Humanities Council Ellis-Shackelford Rehabilitation Project by \$26,955 to a total of \$93,973. At their February 9, 2004 meeting, the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee unanimously concurred with this recommendation.
3. **Consider Increasing the Grant Award for the Pima County Women's Commission Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #640201 for the Royal Johnson Building Rehabilitation** – Staff recommends increasing the grant award for Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #640201 for the Pima County Women's Commission Royal Johnson Building Rehabilitation Project by \$39,578 to a total of \$74,059. At their February 9, 2004 meeting, the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee unanimously concurred with this recommendation.
4. **Consider Grant Award Adjustment to Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #640308 for the Arizona Preservation Foundation Montgomery House Rehabilitation Project** – Staff recommends increasing the grant award for Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #640308 for the Arizona Preservation Foundation Montgomery House Rehabilitation Project by \$5,175 to a total of \$44,825. At their February 9, 2004 meeting, the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee unanimously concurred with this recommendation.

Mr. Porter made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Cordasco seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Stewart noted that the approval of the Minutes included the technical changes that were sent to the Board by the secretary prior to this meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chairman Stewart then moved to Agenda Item J. PARKS.

J. PARKS

Mr. Ream noted that in the Minutes of the meeting that were just approved staff briefed the Board of the disposal of 2.5 acres on Yuma Crossing State Park. It is land that was provided to the agency for recreational and park purposes by the Bureau of Reclamation to the General Services Administration (GSA). He added that representatives of the City of Yuma were present to make a presentation to the Board on this issue and requested that the Board move to Agenda Item J.2.

2. Board Action:

- a. **Yuma Crossing – Parcel Disposal for Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area** – Staff recommends the sale of approximately 2.1 acres, known as Parcel A & B, at Yuma Crossing State Historical Park to the city of Yuma for their National Heritage Area riverfront project, based on a valid

current appraisal, provided that GSA abrogates the historic covenants on the parcel, title to the parcel is conveyed to the City with the Design Guidelines imposed as new deed restrictions, the City of Yuma and Arizona State Parks enter into a revised Intergovernmental Agreement providing for annual contributions to Yuma Crossing State Historic Park, the General Services Administration agrees to the appraised value, and all other agency-standard acquisition requirements are met.

Mr. Ream reported that staff have been working on this issue for approximately five years and are present to provide any information and details the Board may need.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that the Board has had a nice, long partnership with the City of Yuma. Because of the importance with which they hold Yuma Crossing State Park (Yuma Crossing), they entered into an agreement with the Board whereby they convey money to the agency each year to allow continued operation of the park and to keep it open. She noted the Board's appreciation of that long-standing relationship.

Mr. Porter noted his appreciation of the representatives of Yuma to travel this distance to attend this meeting. Because the Board has had such a thorough briefing on this issue, he is satisfied with the project and is comfortable with the idea of the transfer with an exception that he would explain momentarily. He asked whether the other Board members really felt they needed a presentation at this time before discussing approval. He understands that the representatives from Yuma have spent a lot of time preparing their presentation.

Vice Chairman Stewart responded that she would like to have them give a short overview to the Board. It is important for people to understand what the Board is doing. She asked Mr. Porter if he would raise any concerns at this time so it can be incorporated into the comments.

Mr. Porter responded that his only concern is that he is uncomfortable in putting through a motion that approves a sale that has an open-ended unresolved clause that he has no idea of where it will go or what it involves. That clause deals with amending the agreement providing for annual contributions to Yuma Crossing. He understands that it is to be negotiated and that there is some additional payment. His comfort zone is not high enough to vote to complete it without knowing what it will be.

Vice Chairman Stewart responded that the Board has the opportunity to find out what some of the elements may be. She has some comments to make in terms of giving direction to staff about things she would like considered. She believes that can be handled by hearing the presentation and having a discussion.

Mr. Charles Flynn, City of Yuma/Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, addressed the Board. He stated that he appreciated the opportunity to provide this presentation. He will be speaking specifically to the issues raised.

Mr. Flynn stated that amassing the land of Yuma Crossing has taken decades. The critical time was 1996-1997 when the City and Arizona State Parks (ASP) made a commitment for a partnership that essentially said the City would make a commitment of \$1.7 million of capital funds to create the park. The City would then commit \$150,000 per year of funding, to be reviewed every two years. It is important to understand that,

from the City's point of view, one of the critical aspects of this IGA was in 1.d. It says, "... participating with the City and other vested interests in the development of a riverfront master plan which incorporates both state-owned and city-owned properties and collaborating on possible riverfront economic development strategies in support of the park and Yuma Territorial Prison State Park ..." The City understands that to mean, and the vision of the Heritage Area is, to integrate private investment, even into the landmark, adjacent to the parks that will infuse people, activity, and help drive visitation for the parks and help the downtown revitalization. The nearly \$3 million that the City has invested thus far was done on that premise.

Mr. Flynn referred to a slide that showed the acreage, prime real estate, that is in question. Essentially what happened was that in 1997 the Bureau of Reclamation deeded, at no cost to ASP, the entire Yuma Crossing State Park and this additional surplus property. There were a number of issues. There was a historic covenant that prevented any kind of redevelopment. There was a remaining 25-year lease for a City utility function. It was really a blighted area - an industrial area sitting right next to the park and in the downtown area.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that this is right over the park's back fence.

Mr. Flynn responded that it is across the canal. The City discussed how to move ahead. Over the last four or five years the City has developed, with the active involvement of ASP, both the Heritage Area development that will provide major federal funding (matching funding for a lot of things, including ASP) as well as commercial redevelopment.

Mr. Flynn explained that the issue the City faced was that the historic covenant effectively made the site unavailable for redevelopment. More than a year ago the City convened all the stakeholders in order to get everyone's input so that if the City ultimately did abrogate the covenant ways could be found to protect the resources and the landmark.

Mr. Flynn noted that the conveyance can be to a local body, including the City, within the covenant. There were discussions about the historic covenant, the riverfront redevelopment, and the fact that the City was working on amassing not only this land but multiple pieces of property on a 22-acre area. Included in those discussions were National Parks, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, SHPO, the developer, and the City over a couple of months to discuss how to end up with a project that is appropriate to the setting. Design guidelines were created that have already been adopted by the City that provide guidance to designers, local land use, following of zoning laws that dictate use, SHPO has review and comment to the local CLG, and the City has already put a Historical District Overlay that gives their Historic District Review Commission review authority. From that process, the restrictive covenant would be eliminated. It was successful. All parties agreed to it.

Mr. Flynn referred to a slide that showed the layout as proposed. There will be a hotel that will take advantage of the river views to the north. Madison Avenue runs up the middle. The property being discussed runs up and jogs to the north and along the canal. He then referred to a slide that showed the conceptual plan for the hotel. The City cannot work on a development agreement with the developer until it has the land.

They are working toward a development agreement, which would then move ahead with design that would involve SHPO and comment and review from a variety of people through the local process.

Mr. Flynn noted that the first impression people have of Yuma today from the Interstate is vacant, undeveloped land. The view from the Interstate after this project is completed will be much different. The park is to the west of this site. Part of Yuma's problem is its first impression. People do not realize it is a growing, vibrant community. They believe that Gateway Park and the nearly \$20 million private investment will infuse commercial vitality.

Mr. Flynn noted that the first rail in Arizona came across this site 150 years ago. The first thing to be developed on that site was the Southern Pacific Motel. It is historically known as a site for hotels. It is the entryway into the community.

Mr. Flynn stated that once the historic covenant was removed value was therefore created, and GSA noted that there is now value in that property. That cost needs to be paid, and the City agrees to pay that cost. The vehicle to accomplish that, however, is through ASP. There will be no financial obligation to ASP. The City will assure that there is absolutely no liability to ASP associated with this transaction. That means that, ultimately, there will be a \$20 million private investment on this site.

Mr. Flynn added that there are future partnership opportunities. With the creation of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, the City can access up to \$1 million of federal funds for matching projects in the Heritage Area. The Heritage Area plans call for significant investments in both state parks with this federal Heritage money. Unfortunately they have not had the kind of appropriations they would have liked. Whereas most Heritage Areas get \$500,000-\$900,000 they have been getting \$200,000. However, as that improves, the City feels that the Yuma Prison is ripe for a major investment and that the Heritage Area could effectively bring in half the dollars to do the upgrade. He believes the partnership is growing beyond the City to a variety of mechanisms to improve the state parks for the benefit of both ASP and the City.

Mr. Flynn added that the City has been providing funding for programming at Yuma Crossing. They just completed a six-week free concert series at that park. Last Sunday 400 people attended. This is the sort of thing that will infuse people and bring a dynamic quality to this partnership.

Mr. Flynn noted that there are a number of benefits to ASP. The increased visitation by this commercial development is obvious. More particularly to answer the Board's question, they would like to propose (subject to City Council approval) that rather than a two-year agreement as now exists the agreement be extended now through 2009. ASP would have five years' assured funding rather than the current two. It would enable staff to plan accordingly. The only reason to end the agreement in 2009 is that the 2% tax that funds it sunsets in 2009. The Yuma community will have to determine whether it renews the tax and continues to provide that funding. They are willing to extend this agreement to the end of their fiscal capability to do so. At that point they would look at further extensions. ASP would have a five-year planning and operational window that makes the operation so much easier. They now provide \$150,000 per year; they are proposing to increase it to \$175,000. There are those in the City who believe that ASP

should shoulder some of the costs of increased or better operations and are proposing that there be an equal commitment of \$25,000 from ASP. There would then be an annual \$200,000 fund for that park as opposed to \$150,000 today. Given the level of commitment from the City, he believes they simply want to see that ASP understands we are in this together.

Mr. Flynn added that they would also like to see a proposal in the agreement that as this commercial development occurs, if the City has the \$20 million development and ultimately \$40-\$50 million in commercial development, they would like the option of coming to ASP and through private sources to provide the funding of the revenue generated by the park in order to make it a free admission park during the day. It would provide for a free flow of people from the commercial development and make it an integral part of the development while making ASP whole so it is not hurt. A significant amount of people from the community who were not necessarily going there were brought into the park for the concert series they just had. They believe the park will become an important part of the whole development and would like to have the opportunity to make this proposal later as the project develops. As the project goes forward, all of these things would have to be approved by both the City and the Parks Board.

Mr. Flynn expressed his belief that if this commercial development takes off, the community will be supportive of some kind of an extension. He is concerned that if it is unsuccessful and the land sits vacant, the community may not support an extension in 2009. That is why this is so important.

Mr. Flynn added that in the commercial development on First Street, there is a proposal that there be perhaps 25 units of residential development. Creating that mix of residential, office, entertainment, retail, and restaurants means that Yuma Crossing becomes a very important amenity to that whole village development.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if the back part of that development would face the park.

Mr. Kevin Eatherly, City of Yuma, responded that it would face the canal and the park.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that she had recently visited the park. It struck her that with a hotel and development along the canal, it would be important that some landscaping be done by the City either on the City's side of the fence or the park's side so that there is something more appealing to look at than parking lots, trash cans, etc.

Mr. Flynn agreed. The City is putting in a bike path on Second Avenue and that is the kind of thing they would do. The City would seek funds to do that there as well. An improvement on the south side of the canal is critical to make commercial development viable. Landscaping is a requirement in the guidelines discussed earlier. There are specific types that would be within the historic parameters of the park.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that it is her understanding that the revenue agreement with the City provides for \$150,000 from the City. She asked if ASP brings in \$25,000 in revenue it would offset that amount.

Mr. Flynn responded that the additional revenue does not offset but rather adds to it.

Mr. Travous added that that additional revenue remains at the park.

Mr. Ream added that in 2003 Yuma Crossing brought in \$30,268 and had approximately 14,945 visitors with a net operating cost of \$206,613.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that it was her observation at her last two visits to the park that there is not much visitation. With the level of the exhibits there now, she believes that the Board needs to revisit the fees being charged. She believes that \$2-\$3 is more appropriate for what is being currently offered. She understands that there are discussions with the City and the Historic District about refocusing the three museums so that they each have a clearer identification. Obviously, that will require some investment by ASP and, hopefully, some of this money can go there as well as at Yuma Prison.

Mr. Eatherly responded that one of the commitments that the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area award has made this year is to help fund portions of an exhibit master plan. They have received a proposal from their consultant that they will provide to staff via a letter that will state what commitment Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area is prepared to make towards a new exhibit master plan.

Mr. Flynn added that they really believe that the key to visitation is to infuse development. His goal is that five years from now as many people are coming into that park from across the bridge and from the new development area as are coming from the parking area. It now becomes an integrated part of the hotel, the whole development area, and there will already be thousands of people on site viewing this park.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that there was mention of eliminating the park fee. She asked how the City might view a major fee reduction instead of a complete elimination of fees.

Mr. Flynn responded that the City is suggesting in its proposal that it would make the park whole. Their goal would be to make it easily accessible and available to all those people who will be in the new development area and to assure that that doesn't mean that the park loses any revenues. They believe that the park is a natural amphitheater area. This is where the City held those concerts. Integrating it, not just for visitors but also for residents, is an important part of the experience for Yumans. That is what they want to get at. They would hope not only to replace that funding, but also to look for other sources such as the Heritage Area and others to upgrade and update the amenities. He would like to see a day when there are lunchtime brownbag lunches or concerts there every day throughout the winter season funded by outside sources to bring people into the park. He believes it is a critical element of their redevelopment strategy in the Heritage Area. They appreciate this partnership.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that the Board believes that it is an important element of ASP's future to really get the local communities involved, and to have visitation by Arizona residents in addition to out-of-state visitors. The Board appreciates this partnership.

Mr. Porter stated that he now has a higher comfort level and better understands what the City has in mind. He believes that the proposed motion does seem to call for that IGA to be amended as a condition of final approval. He assumes that it would come back to the Board and that they would have an idea of what was happening.

Mr. Ream responded that staff would get the Board approval for disposal today, staff would then seek the JCCR approval, staff would then negotiate the IGA with the City of Yuma, bring the IGA back to the Board for approval, then take it to the City of Yuma for Council approval, then close on the disposal at that time. The motion to approve the disposal today is just the first of six steps.

Mr. Flynn added that it is clear from the discussions they have had with Administration and Council that they would bring a variety of actions before Council, including the IGA, as part of the process to get to the development agreement. There is a commitment to understanding that August 1 is the final date. They need to pass something this spring either in advance of or concurrent with the transfer.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Board authorizes the sale of approximately 2.1 acres, known as Parcel A & B, at Yuma Crossing State Historical Park to the City of Yuma for their National Heritage Area riverfront project, based on a valid current appraisal, provided that the GSA abrogates the historic covenants on the parcel, title to the parcel is conveyed to the City with the Design Guidelines imposed as new deed restrictions, the City of Yuma and ASP enter into a revised Intergovernmental Agreement providing for annual contributions to Yuma Crossing State Historic Park, the General Services Administration agrees to the appraised value, and all other agency-standard acquisition requirements are met.

Mr. Beechum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Flynn thanked the Board and stated his hope that the State Parks Board can have a future meeting at the new hotel in Yuma.

1. Section report

Sedona Fire District Update Regarding Possible Slide Rock Fire Station

Mr. Ream reported that a representative from Sedona Fire District was present. He introduced Deputy Chief Matt Shobert, who gave the presentation a year ago in Oro Valley. Last fall an MOU was signed with the Sedona Fire District (Fire District) and the Forest Service. There has been one meeting with the Fire District. Staff and some Board members visited the site this morning. He asked that Mr. Shobert report to the Board what the Fire District's needs are.

Mr. Matt Shobert addressed the Board. He welcomed the Board to their facility. He reported that there have been some meetings with staff and there has been success towards the evaluation of the validity of the endeavor. From his vantage point, things look as though it certainly is a valid endeavor. They envision a small facility utilizing the grounds at the southernmost end of Slide Rock State Park (Slide Rock). It would be an apparatus base for upwards of three apparatus (one fire engine, one water truck, and one ambulance) as well as whatever apparatus ASP would need and crew quarters for 24-hour living for firefighters seven days a week 365 days a year. The acreage would be 3-5 acres, with 3 acres being optimal to encompass a small fire station with room to pull fire apparatus into the facility.

Mr. Shobert noted that currently their firefighters are housed at the fire station at Indian Gardens. They are very overcrowded there. Their septic system is nonexistent. It is not a good long-term plan. Their lease expires in about 5.5 years. If progress continues to be made with the Slide Rock plan, it would be a win-win venue for both sides.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that there was mention of living quarters for firefighters. She asked how many that would be.

Mr. Shobert responded it would be 3 firefighters 24 hours a day. That is their maximum staffing projection for that station for the long-range plan. It would be a much smaller structure than this facility. It would be upwards of 1500 sq. ft. maximum living and training space/quarters plus space for three apparatus. Any Board needs for living quarters, training space, office space, etc., for its staff it could be incorporated.

Mr. Porter noted that living quarters would be important to the Board. Another major concern is the effluent. He asked where discussions stand on that issue.

Mr. Shobert responded that it is still under discussion. In speaking of fair market value of the property (3 acres on the south side of Slide Rock), the piece has some value. They are not looking for a free ride. They would be more than happy to make up the cost of the land and ASP's contribution in the development of infrastructure improvements whether it be wastewater enhancements or infrastructure. This is what needs to be fine tuned and designed. They are currently working on a small strategic plan that outlines preferred timelines and options available to continue.

Mr. Porter noted this is something that probably should be brought to a head fairly soon. It has been under discussion for quite a while.

Mr. Shobert agreed. They would like to move ahead as quickly as possible.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that one of the major issues has been the participation of the Forest Service and the potential for a land trade.

Mr. Shobert responded that the Forest Service is still agreeable to do that. However, in dealing with a federal agency it could take upwards of 10 years to accomplish and the Fire District's needs are relatively short-term.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if that is the case even with the assistance of their legislators and congressmen.

Ms. Emery responded that it could take an Act of Congress.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that there may need to be some encouragement. The Fire District would be in a better position to accomplish it than the Board.

Ms. Emery responded that this has been discussed. It appears that waiting for the Forest Service could be a major hurdle if it depends on a land exchange. There has been discussion about developing an interim strategy with the ultimate goal of an exchange. If the exchange happens, it will be 15 years down the road.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if it is possible to get a lease on some Forest Service land to discharge the effluent in a shorter period of time.

Mr. Ream responded that before getting into discussions of effluent or a water treatment system it will be necessary to bring in an engineering consultant to determine the kind of land we have, how many gallons can be handled, etc. The summer visitation is so high that in order to predict the amount of gallons of water that will be used a day those high numbers must be used. They are astronomically high numbers in the summer.

Mr. Pace estimated the monthly summer visitation to be approximately 50,000.

Mr. Ream stated that it would require a big plant to handle that kind of capacity. Staff don't know how much effluent the park will have. A consultant needs to look at the situation.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that one of the things that impressed the Board last year was the figure of 70% of the Fire District's calls are either at or near the park. Today the Board learned that over a five-year period there were 800 people who needed to be taken by ambulance from the park due to injuries. The park has high percentage of accidents that do need trained paramedics.

Mr. Shobert noted that the Fire District's average response time was 6 minutes and 12 seconds. If they were on-site it would be 30 seconds for paramedics.

Mr. Porter asked what the next step in the process is.

Mr. Shobert responded that the parties continue to meet on a regular basis. They have discussed the fact that the Forest Service will take 10-12 years. A question was raised as to whether ASP would do a 10-12 year lease for 3 acres of property to the Fire District until the land issues are squared away. They are trying to decide how to streamline the process before spending any money on consultants.

Ms. Emery added that at the last meeting the parties agreed that they would each try to precisely identify their needs, goals, and objectives, circulate them, discuss them, and then quantify them. In dealing with effluent, they need to determine what size plant is needed, what sort of facility and size the Fire District needs, and exactly what would happen there. Then it would be easier to begin making assessments as to whether it would work for everyone.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked what the timeline would be.

Ms. Emery responded that the parties hoped to have a plan drafted for this meeting. That turned out to be impossible.

Mr. Ream added that staff would set a goal to have a feasibility study to present to the Board in May.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated her belief that the sense of the Board a year ago and where they are coming from today is that they would still like to see this pursued and work it out. The Board also has an obligation as fiduciaries of the state's land to ensure that it is doing what is in the best interests of ASP and the public.

Mr. Shobert responded that it is good to hear that and assured this Board that their goal is to be on that site some day. However, their goal is to make it as beneficial to the Board as it is for the Fire District.

Mr. Porter stated that it sounds as though the Fire District is coming up against somewhat of a pressure deadline with the lease expiring in a number of years and the current crowded conditions. He would not like to see it get out from under the parties. If it's not going to work then he would like the parties to reach that conclusion soon. If it looks like it's feasible, then he'd like to get something going.

Mr. Shobert added that another benefit about the Slide Rock location is that it is very central to the community and populace they serve in the canyon. It isn't just the response time to the people who visit the park, but to the rest of the canyon as well.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that the Board would like to have this issue on the Agenda for the May meeting in the form of a strategic plan. She stated the Board's appreciation for the update and the invitation to meet in their facility. She noted that some of the Board members may want to take a quick tour after the meeting to get a sense of what kind of facility they would want to put in place on the park.

Mr. Shobert responded he would be happy to do so. It is important to know that this structure is much larger than what they envision at Slide Rock. It is more the size of their facility at Sedona Shadows, four miles due west of here. It is a small structure that blends in nicely with the surrounding area.

Slide Rock State Park Report

Mr. Ream introduced Steve Pace, Park Manager, Slide Rock State Park. He noted that he has worked with Mr. Pace for 24 years on and off. Mr. Pace is, in his opinion, one of the best Park Managers at one of the busiest state parks in the system.

Mr. Pace welcomed the Board to Sedona and stated that it is great to have the Board here. He appreciated the opportunity to spend some time with some of the Board members this morning at the park.

Mr. Pace reported that the Slide Rock property consists of 43 acres and was purchased in July 1986 and opened in July 1987. He noted that the 43 acres does not include the Slide Rock swim area. There are 10 acres that encompass the swim area that is owned by the Forest Service. ASP and Forest Service cooperatively manage that area through an MOU. An MOU works fine locally. However, the Forest Service Supervisor's Office or Albuquerque or even Washington, DC do not like the MOU. They even say that it is illegal. They want ASP to operate under a permit system which means that the agency would pay them for making a profit on Forest Service Land. Staff do not believe that the agency should pay the Forest Service for doing their job. While there is an impasse, it is generally agreed that the best solution is for ASP to own those 10 acres outright. Staff have been working on that exchange for quite some time. That is one of the park's big issues.

Mr. Pace reported that annual visitation at Slide Rock is about 250,000; revenue is about \$5,500,000 per year. This year their operating budget is \$47,500. They have five full-time staff at the park, 2.5 full-time equivalent temporary staff, and .5 full-time equivalent intern position. They also had about 400 hours donated by volunteers.

Mr. Pace reported that there is a concession contract with Recreation Resource Management at Slide Rock. They run a store as well as operate and manage the

orchard. The store is in a small structure and sells food items (lunch, picnic supplies, drinks, snacks, and souvenirs). The revenue that ASP received from the store last year was \$7,000. They are not a big money maker for the park, but they provide very good service for the visitors. They also operate the orchard, which consists of about 500 apple trees and a few cherry and peach trees.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked what happens to the fruit.

Mr. Pace responded that the fruit is sold in the market.

Mr. Pace reported that there are some major issues in addition to the land ownership discussed earlier. Creek water quality is probably the issue staff spend the most time with.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that that issue causes the park to be closed several times a year.

Mr. Pace responded that the park is not closed. People are not permitted to get into the water. This happens several times during the year. Last summer it occurred 12 times because the water exceeded the "safe" level for bacteria. When people are not allowed in the water visitation drops by about half. The park easily loses \$1,000-\$1,500 per day when people can't get in the water.

Mr. Porter asked if there is an average time frame when the park has a prohibition in place for getting in the water.

Mr. Pace responded that it will last at least a day; sometimes it goes two or three days. Staff have set up a state-licensed water quality laboratory at Slide Rock. Staff spend a lot of time sampling the water. Five different sites are sampled every day during the summer (Memorial Day through Labor Day). During the off-season staff sample at least once or twice a week.

Mr. Porter asked whether staff feel most of the contamination is actually arising from the park usage or coming from higher up the Creek as well.

Mr. Pace responded that one's gut reaction would be that all the swimmers at Slide Rock are causing the pollution. That was the initial belief held by ADEQ personnel. However, recent studies have shown that that is not the case. The majority of the pollution is coming in from upstream. The visitors certainly contribute to it, but the majority is coming from upstream and is animal (wildlife) pollution rather than human. The biggest polluter appears to be raccoon. Even though the park's visitors are not the problem, it is the park's problem and staff are charged with working with the regulatory agencies to try to resolve the problem using Best Management Practices (limiting the number of people in the water at one time). Aside from killing off all of the animals, there is really not much staff can do about the problem. This is a problem that the park will live with as long as it is in existence.

Mr. Pace reported that another issue is the wild land fire danger. Oak Creek Canyon is in the top ten nationally as a fire hazard for catastrophic wildfire with the potential for a high loss of human life and property losses. It is also a loss of revenue for the park. Two years ago the park was closed for five weeks because of the fire danger. When

there is a fire nearby the Canyon, as well as the park, is usually closed. The park serves as a fire station for fire crews. A lot of revenue is lost due to fires.

Mr. Pace reported that other issues at Slide Rock are the same issue other parks have: development, budget issues, etc.

Mr. Cordasco asked about the relationship the park has with ADOT regarding parking along the highway.

Mr. Pace responded that parking along the highway was a big issue. Before the barriers were put in place by ADOT, people would park along the side of the road. He once counted almost 90 cars parked within 1/2 mile of the entrance gate outside the park. The park only has 158 parking spaces. There was a substantial impact outside the park. ADOT put barriers in place and it has helped quite a bit. People are willing to walk a long distance to get to Slide Rock. They travel from Michigan to see the park and they intend to see it.

Mr. Cordasco asked if parking might be included in the Fire District discussions.

Mr. Ream responded that staff can certainly look into it. He noted that only so much of the park can be paved because it impacts the park's carrying capacity. When the parking lot is full, there are more than enough people at Slide Rock. If a lot more parking places are put in, then no one will have space to have fun.

Mr. Porter noted that the desire is to find that perfect middle ground. If the parking lot becomes too large then the whole experience is destroyed. It is a dilemma.

Mr. Ream added that there is potential for creating a shuttle drop-off point as part of the work with the Fire District. A shuttle could come into town so people could park in Sedona and ride a shuttle out to Slide Rock and back. There currently is no safe place to pull off and let people out.

Ms. Emery noted that there would need to be a requirement for a separate entrance for the fire trucks so they don't have to get into the line of traffic. If ASP had control of it, then a shuttle bus could be allowed in at that entrance.

Mr. Travous noted that staff would have to look at some other things as well. There are issues with visual distance as well as a number of engineering issues to deal with.

Vice Chairman Stewart thanked Mr. Pace for the tour of the park this morning and this presentation.

Fort Verde Historic State Park Report

Mr. Ream introduced Sheila Stubler, Park Manager, Ft. Verde State Historic Park (Ft. Verde), the newest Park Manager in the system.

Ms. Stubler stated that she has been with the agency for 6 months and 3 days. She then presented a slide show on Ft. Verde. The park is located in the heart of downtown Camp Verde.

Ms. Stubler reported that the fort was established in 1871 and was abandoned in 1891. At that time, the fort consisted of 55 acres. It averaged 120 troops, with a maximum of 250. There are four original buildings that are still there today: the headquarters

building (the original administrative office), the Commanding Officer's quarters, the school house, and the Surgeon's quarters.

Ms. Stubler noted that the Camp Verde Historical Society owned the buildings before ASP acquired it. Ft. Verde became a state park in 1971.

Ms. Stubler noted that there are a number of special events held at Ft. Verde. History of the Soldier is on April 17-18, and includes recognition of anyone who was in the military. Ft. Verde Days are held the second week in October and includes reenactments. General Crook's birthday is celebrated in September. On Veterans Day the park has a flag lowering ceremony. There is also a Victorian Christmas, at which time the homes are decorated in the style of the period. There are a number of tea parties that take place throughout the year.

Ms. Stubler reported that educational opportunities include field trips, the Jr. Ranger Program, the Teacher's Guide and Curriculum, and a junior historian program (still in the works).

Ms. Stubler reported that attendance in 2003 decreased to 15,752 but the revenue increased to \$36,345. Visitation by school groups were down in 2003. So far, in 2004 it appears that more school groups are coming to the park.

Ms. Stubler reported that recent improvements include the privacy fencing, the picket fencing, and painting. The town built a new ramada at the park where the tour buses can unload. Additional space for storage has been created, a new cooling and heating system has been installed, paint analysis of the original colors has been accomplished and appropriate historical colors have been applied to the windows. The park has some new museum displays. The Indian Scout display has received a number of compliments from people. The heliograph and the latrine exhibits have been added. The heliograph exhibits details methods of communication among the troops. The latrine exhibit contains artifacts that were found when new pipes were being put in behind the Chamber of Commerce. It includes whiskey bottles, beer bottles, part of a broken spur, part of a hairbrush, a shoe, and parts of a shoe. The majority of artifacts found were bottles.

Ms. Stubler reported that projects underway include repainting the headquarters and refinishing the surgeon's quarters.

Mr. Winkleman arrived at the meeting at this point.

Ms. Stubler reported that there are some problems and obstacles. There has been animosity from some townspeople. A lot of it resulted from when the Camp Verde Historical Society and the town owned it and then ASP acquired it. There has been animosity over how things should be handled. Because it is a historical site, staff must go through the historic policies and procedures to maintain the historical site the way it is supposed to be maintained. Not everyone agrees with that, but staff have policies and procedures they must follow. Some of the problems include some townspeople wanting to bring in livestock such as horses to attract tourists. They wanted to add a blacksmith shop. While some of the ideas were great, staff need to maintain the purity of the site.

Mr. Cordasco noted that staff gave a great presentation to the City Council that was well-accepted and appreciated.

Ms. Stubler responded that her background in working with inner city parks was focusing on community. This is not just a state park – it is a community park. She has tried to work with the community to work and help them understand the procedures and try to find ways to compromise.

Ms. Stubler reported that another obstacle is the Army fort image. She is working with representatives from the Yavapai Apache Nation to provide a well-rounded picture of everything that may have occurred from that era. Relating all the stories involved is what completes the book. It would be good to present the Apache side of the story. This park should be a partnership among the National Park Service, the Town of Camp Verde, the Yavapai Apache Nation, and whatever other entities were involved to help make the park better.

Ms. Stubler reported that Holloman Road, the road that cuts through the park, is another obstacle. Sometimes people who live at the end of the road cut through the park at 45 mph to get to work. This is an accident waiting to happen. Because the road belongs to the town, it would be a town liability.

Ms. Stubler reported that limited display space is an obstacle. They have volunteers who help build display cases. It is difficult finding space to put things. There currently is minimal space available.

Ms. Stubler reported that the park has acquired an updated computer system, and a digital camera and scanner.

Ms. Stubler reported that plans for the future include reconstructing the barracks and working with ADOT to reroute Holloman Road. There are a few homes for sale that would be good to acquire if funding were available. Her vision for the park is to work with the community on increasing the programs for the school groups and rerouting Holloman Road.

Mr. Porter asked if staff have been drawn into the plans or discussions under way for creating a rather long hiking/biking trail coming from the east. The intentions are that this trail will end at this park. One of the prime obstacles was to get the Apache Tribes signed on. It appears that it is moving along and has been very well received by all of the elements, including the US Forest Service and the BLM. It could have the potential down the road to significantly increase visitation.

Ms. Stubler responded that she recently attended a Council meeting where this subject was discussed. She has heard a little about it but has not been directly involved.

Mr. Porter noted that there is long-range dream out there that has been on the books for a long time to eventually have a master trail come from the south, bypass the Valley, and come up into that area. This is something the Board should begin to pay attention to before it gets out from under us.

Ms. Stubler added that another accomplishment was getting signage from ADOT. Staff have received the necessary permit. There will be two new signs coming south on I-17. There isn't anything in that direction to advertise the park.

Vice Chairman Stewart thanked Ms. Stubler for her presentation. She noted that Mr. Costello is present in the audience, but is not on the Agenda. She stated that it is important that the May Agenda include a short presentation on Peck's Lake. It has the potential to be a real opportunity for the agency.

ADA Compliance at Parks

Ms. Nicole Armstrong Best, ADA and Volunteer Coordinator, reported that the Americans with Disabilities Act was enacted in 1990. As a state agency, ASP is required to comply to Title I (employment) and Title II (program access and activities access). She deals with Title II. For most agencies this means having access to getting drivers' licenses or attending trials, or like issues. For ASP, recreational access really leads to recreational opportunities. That is what the agency provides to the general public and that is what the agency should be trying to provide to park visitors with disabilities.

Ms. Best reported that activities ASP provides under ADA include accessible boat launches at some of the parks, accessible fishing piers, and fish cleaning stations. To be truly accessible a camping site should have a raised platform. The agency has only one truly accessible campsite at Dead Horse Ranch State Park. There are several accessible sites from the perspective of having accessible picnic tables, the ability to get from the parking area to the pad; but to truly provide that level of independence for wheelchair users platforms are necessary. She would like to look at trying to get more platforms built throughout the system. She added that staff are always trying to ensure that the exhibits are accessible.

Ms. Best added that an example of recreational access includes access to hiking trails. Hiking is a recreational opportunity that ASP provides. We should be considering accessible trails. At this point in time, the ADA does not cover outdoor recreational opportunities like this. There are, however, published guidelines that are sitting at the Department of Justice for review. Staff are attempting to, by using the Universal Trail Assessment Program (UTAP), get an inventory of our trails in order to begin formal discussions about which of the trails are close to being accessible and what needs to be done to make some of them accessible. It is not enough to just take the easy trails (i.e., nature trails) and make them accessible. One of the big issues in the disability community is access to the points of interest of the location. If the point of interest for the location is the travertine bridge at Tonto, it is not enough to give them access to a nature trail off to the side. However, because it is impossible to make access to the bridge possible without altering the landmark, overlooks were put in place so that it can at least be viewed.

Ms. Best noted that volunteers are doing a lot of the work at 14 parks. A trail at Catalina was redone last week because some of it was washed out from the rains early in the season. A group will be going to Picacho. An assessment team requires a minimum of three people. It takes about an hour to do 600-800 feet of trail.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked for a point of clarification on the UTAP assessment. She asked if the trails are being examined to determine if they are accessible and what can be done to make them accessible or if they are actually being made accessible.

Ms. Best responded that an inventory is being taken to determine what we have. Staff are looking at the key elements of the trail to see what can be done. Another part of UTAP is the ability to generate reports and signage. This information is very useful to the user whether or not the trail is changed and whether or not they have disabilities. A mother with a stroller can see what the average grade of a trail is and determine whether or not it would be difficult to get the stroller through it. Dead Horse is the only park that is signed at this time. Homolovi is considering being signed.

Ms. Best noted that interpretive services must be provided. The agency is required to pay for it. A two-week advance notice is requested in order to provide for time to get a qualified interpreter on the premises. As an example, a tour group is coming to Kartchner Caverns State Park (KCSP) March 30. They call themselves, "The Deaf Snowbirds," and have booked five tours. Five interpreters will be there, along with two volunteers to assist who are not certified but know how to sign.

Ms. Best stated that visual describings is new area that was developed through performance theater areas for people who have limited vision. There is training available. There is an issue with captioning in that it is very expensive to caption videos. Staff are working with other agencies for assistance. Yuma Crossing has an orientation video that needed to be captioned. BLM has the ability to do that, so the agency partnered with them to take care of it. The cost will be \$600-\$800 per half-hour of tape.

Ms. Best added that assisted listening devices is an area that is being explored. Many visitors have impaired hearing but are not deaf. These devices are essentially an FM system where the interpreter speaks into a microphone that broadcasts to a headset. It does not amplify the voice but rather goes directly to the person who has checked out that headset. The cost is \$700-\$800 for one transmitter and three receivers. She would like to see them available at KCSP and Riordan Mansion. Braille is provided when requested. It is not requested often because the percentage of people who have visual impairments who know Braille is very small. There is a free resource from the Arizona Office of Americans with Disabilities. Materials are offered in alternative formats when requested, such as a cassette tape and scripts in large letters.

Ms. Best noted that an area of problem access relates to facility access – can they get through the door, is there a restroom stall with the correct dimensions, is there an accessible shower, etc. The answer is yes. Staff are very aware of the requirements. Staff have made sure that at least one yurt and one cabin are accessible.

Ms. Best noted that one complaint from those with disabilities is that while there may be accessible parking spots, buildings, visitor center, etc., they can't get to it because something is wrong with the pathway between the two. Care must be taken to ensure that there is no blockage of the access route.

Ms. Best reported that there is a request for a specific accommodation at Dead Horse from people who have multiple chemical sensitivities. Everyday substances that may not affect others such as fragrances, smoke, etc., affect these people. A trail has been created for them in an area that has never been sprayed. This trail is also wheelchair accessible. The trail is almost complete with 360 feet left to go. It is expected to be completed in April.

Ms. Best stated that there is an ADA committee that includes representatives from each region. This committee has met twice. They are taking a more proactive look at what the agency is doing in this area. They are looking at alternative cleaning products, especially at Dead Horse and perhaps Red Rock. Their next meeting will be at Dead Horse on March 31. She invited the Board to join them. The meeting is at 10:00 a.m.

Ms. Best reported that customer service training is being provided because of some incidents that have occurred and a general desire to involve park staff in this area. This training has been provided with the assistance of the Arizona Office of Americans with Disabilities to park managers, volunteers, staff at KCSP, and some Central Region staff.

Ms. Best reported that the facilities inventory is a project that will be pursued in the next couple of months. The new development is in compliance, but there are some buildings in some areas that were built prior to ADA. Staff want to ensure they are compliant.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that she attended the Accessibility Trails Conference ASCOT put on recently. She understood from that conference that the agency is required to provide recreational access; it is just that the guidelines have not yet been adopted. Even so, the agency is required to do something. California State Parks was sued for not having gone forward with a plan.

Ms. Best responded that the agency is required under Program Access to provide access; however the actual guidelines on how to do it have not been added to the law. From a Risk Management standpoint, the agency should be following those guidelines that are out there.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that there was also a discussion on the importance of providing access to some of the key features, not necessarily all of them. She asked if there is a program whereby staff are identifying which features are accessible in parks. She understands that Dead Horse may be ahead of some of the other parks in having accessible trails and that they have had people go through UTAP training.

Ms. Best responded that Homolovi is very accessible as well. Oracle has trained and is working on trails. There is a program to identify features that are accessible, however it will be a confluence of getting the trail inventory completed, checking out facilities to ensure they are accessible, and then sitting down and trying to get the big picture.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if there is an effort in putting in new trails to do what is possible to make at least the first part of those trails accessible.

Ms. Best responded that it depends on the trail. It is not always possible to make every trail accessible. It is a consideration.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that it is important for a number of reasons. The Governor has recently requested every state agency to devise a plan to accommodate Arizona residents as they age and develop more infirmities. The Board does not want a lawsuit like California had. The agency has instituted free passes for disabled veterans. They will certainly want to see something other than the restrooms or the campground showers.

Ms. Best responded that a lot of the work that is done is in regard to mobility impairments. Staff do not want to lose site of some of the other impairments. Staff need to be more proactive in providing interpretive services or assisted hearing devices.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if there is any funding set aside specifically for doing these things.

Ms. Best responded affirmatively.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if there is a program within the agency to make the rangers and managers throughout the system aware of the proposed standards and newer materials that can blend in with the environment while providing easier access.

Ms. Best responded that there has been some training on UTAP. More information should be shared with some of the parks that may not have that kind of knowledge.

Volunteers at Parks

Ms. Best reported that the agency has about 700 volunteers who work on grounds in the Operations area of the parks. These figures do not reflect friends groups' volunteers or the Site Steward Program volunteers. If the agency had to pay for their services, including benefits, the hourly wage would be \$16.54 per hour as set by the independent sector for the non-profit arena as a national average hourly wage. This would be the equivalent of 67 full-time employees. There are volunteers at every park. The quantity of support from volunteers cannot even touch on the quality that the volunteers bring to the table in the form of enthusiasm, educational level, or energy they expend.

Ms. Best reported that some of the parks have a high number of volunteers (Alamo, Red Rock, KCSP, Tonto, Catalina, Tubac, Dead Horse, and Verde Valley Greenway). Some of the things the volunteers do for the park include camp hosting, interpretive programs, taking entry fees, administrative support, and maintenance.

Ms. Best reported that staff are attempting to improve recordkeeping regarding volunteers. Currently volunteers and their hours are tracked. There needs to be an accounting of how many hours are worked in the interpretive area vs. the maintenance area in order to get an idea of what kind of support is being given across the regions. There is a difference between onsite volunteers (usually from out-of-state) and offsite volunteers (usually from surrounding communities). Staff want to ensure that parks that have communities nearby have invited them in and are using volunteers from the community rather than just relying on out-of-state people. There is also a need to track the support of group service projects. These would include the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Lions Clubs, etc., who come out to perform a specific project for the parks.

Ms. Best noted that there is an ongoing issue with ensuring that park staff who work with the volunteer program understand all of the issues. An internal volunteer management basics training program will be offered in the near future.

Ms. Best noted that there are new pressures on the agency, such as the increase in size of the gift shops. Resources at the parks are not increasing to keep up with the additional needs. Staff are trying to look at nontraditional recruitment efforts. There is a Title V program – the Senior Community Education Program. It is a federally-funded program that provides eligible seniors with a minimum-wage income for 20 hours a

week if they work at an approved non-profit or government agency. Staff are looking at getting some Title V people placed in the Phoenix Office, Oracle State Park, and Jerome. They would be volunteers for the agency but paid by a grant. Another effort is the Kartchner Youth Service Project. Two-thirds of the volunteers at KCSP are winter visitors. They leave in the summer. The park is very busy in the summer. They are trying to fill that gap and have been talking with the school districts in Sierra Vista, Benson, St. Davids, and Tombstone to set up a youth service project for the summer. Recruitment will begin next month, selection in May, training in June, and they would begin working in July/August.

Ms. Best reported that next week there will be a Volunteer Recognition and Training event. She distributed invitations to the Board.

Mr. Porter stated that he is certainly impressed with where things stand, but he is not satisfied with where things stand. Eight of the parks account for 3/4 of all of the volunteers that are being used. That suggests to him that there is a need at some of the other parks to really begin stressing the need to recruit from the local population. In a lot of places it gives a ready-made army when there is a need from time to time to flex some muscle whether it is in getting out and organizing letter-writing campaigns or fundraising. He believes there will be a greater fundraising role from volunteers and support for parks in the years to come. This has to happen.

Ms. Best agreed with Mr. Porter's comments. She noted that staff are pursuing that. There have been consultations with Ft. Verde and Jerome to look at volunteer programs. There are issues. Alamo will probably not get more volunteers than they currently have because of their location.

Mr. Porter stated that he believes that the message needs to get out into the local communities around the parks that are supported by and receive benefit from the parks that there isn't a single one of our parks, with the exceptions of Lake Havasu, KCSP and maybe Slide Rock, that are not far away from being closed. They could be threatened on relatively short notice down the road due to budget issues or changes in the thrust of state government. We really need to have the support in place ready to justify the parks and support them. They must understand that the agency needs to have that partnership in place.

Ms. Best responded that staff are working toward increasing that partnership.

Vice Chairman Stewart suggested offering a scientific course on cave geology at KCSP for the youth program.

Issues with ADEQ

Mr. Ream reported that the background of this issue is that in December staff received Notice of Violations from ADEQ on 16 of the parks' public water systems. The types of violations were detailed in a memorandum dated March 18, 2004 and distributed to the Board at this meeting. Violations included failure to monitor, failure to take repeat samples after a failure in the monitoring system, some were failure to conduct annual nitrate monitoring (staff received erroneous information from ADEQ that it was to be performed every three years), failure to notify the public of failures. Most of these are standard operating procedure failures on the part of staff that need to be corrected.

Mr. Ream reported that there was also a failure to obtain Approvals to Construct and Approval of Construction for new potable wells at KCSP, Picacho, Oracle, and Roper Lake. He noted that staff did get permits to construct from the Department of Water Resources; the failure was to get the permits to ADEQ. Even though staff did the monitoring in most cases, there is a permit step that was neglected.

Mr. Ream noted that staff are meeting weekly with ADEQ to review all of the violations. Since then a system spreadsheet has been developed and ADEQ has been provided with a table summarizing all of ASP Board facilities that included the wastewater facilities where there are no current violations.

Mr. Ream added that staff are not finished with the Determination of Applicability (DOA) yet. Work has just begun. There are some permitting and funding issues that need to be cleared with ADEQ. He believes they want \$100 per DOA. They will waive that fee and staff will continue work on it.

Mr. Ream reported that an ADEQ Compliance staff position has been announced. The person who held that position left the agency early in the fall. After his departure from the agency it was discovered that he had neglected some of his duties. Once that position is filled, the standard operating procedures will be revised. Staff are working on getting certified operators at each park who are not to be treated as a simple "paper" assignment. Staff are attempting to get a stipend or monetary credit for certification. These people with the certification should be paid a little extra to keep that certification and keep these things up to date.

Mr. Ream reported that a simple flow chart is being developed that details each step to be followed.

Mr. Ream noted that one of the problems was that staff were sending the samples into the State Health Lab for testing. The lab would then send them on to ADEQ. The State Health Lab uses their own forms for testing but ADEQ does not accept the State Health Lab forms for testing. ASP was receiving a failure notice on those samples because the correct form was not filled out. Staff believe that problem has been solved. Both forms will be filled out at the same time the State Health Lab will forward both forms to ADEQ.

Mr. Ream reported that a consultant was hired to perform all of the permitting on the wells.

Mr. Ream reported that staff have just received a draft Consent Order. This is a legal document that the agency will be obliged to sign when it is in final form stating that the agency will do all of these things and then some in order to get rid of the Notices of Violation and get back on an even keel with ADEQ. There are a lot of regulations and it requires a lot of work just to keep the water systems running at the parks.

Mr. Ream noted that the Picacho Peak Water Company (from whom the park buys water for Picacho Peak) is under scrutiny by ADEQ because they have been delivering high nitrate for a lot of years and have failed to do anything to comply with regulations. There notices throughout the park to not drink the water and notices about the high nitrate level in the water. The water company has been given until March 15 to come up with a plan for fixing that water.

Ms. Hernbrode stated she spoke with the attorney who Picacho Water Company hired. He intended to get all of the information to ADEQ on the 15th as to what their plan is to be in compliance. She attended the water company's board's last meeting and they approved the attorney to go forward with that plan. As part of that process, ADEQ is threatening to sue everyone associated with the water company and that would potentially include ASP.

Mr. Ream noted that the regulations are very difficult to wade through. The technical side is not as difficult as wading through all of the procedures and regulations and Consent Orders. He has not had an opportunity to read the Consent Order yet and cannot report on its contents.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if the agency operates its own water system at all 16 parks.

Ms. Emery responded that we have 22; at others we use City water. Even though those parks take City water there are distribution systems within the parks. They will start to require a certain amount of monitoring there.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that the agency was issued Notices of Violations for 16 out of the 22 parks where the agency operates water systems.

Mr. Porter stated that he understands how the regulations are and he understands the idiosyncrasies of the information not being on the right form. When he saw this he was very bothered. It is not a good track record. An agency such as ASP really should be in the forefront of not having these problems. He knows that's easy to say. He wants to make it clear that he does not want to see a continuing pattern like this in years to come.

Vice Chairman Stewart added that she was very concerned about this as well. People have become seriously ill and even died as a result of problems with water systems. Although these may be recordkeeping kinds of things, if there is a history of recordkeeping problems and then a more serious problem surfaces, it creates tremendous liability issues. She is most troubled about the fact that she was approached when she was shopping by a colleague from the past who, when she mentioned she was on the Parks Board, asked what is being done about these violations with the water systems. She was unaware of any violations. This was well before the December meeting. The Board had a January meeting, yet this is the first time that this issue has been brought to the Board's attention. She happened to be in the office when staff were served with some of these violations after the January meeting. She believes this is the sort of thing the Board wants to be notified about right away by E-mail to at least know that it is going on. This is the sort of thing that can hit the newspapers. The Board members need to have some kind of initial notification. She is troubled by the fact that this is the first time it is on the Agenda. She believes that this is an area where we need to be exemplary and not just in the middle of the pack.

Mr. Ream responded that this was way more than he anticipated. He is a Grade II Water Operator, himself. The massive turnover in water operators and people filling in the gaps is one of the biggest problems. Even though there may be a hundred reasons why we have these violations, the fact is that we shouldn't have them.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that when the agency is performing a function that has the potential to affect people's health and safety, there is an obligation to ensure that there are no cracks.

Mr. Ream responded that that is precisely why it is being handled at the level it is. He is personally handling it along with Ms. Emery. He attends the meetings with ADEQ. He believes they are reassured by the fact that staff are making these weekly meetings; they take copious notes at the meetings. There is a meeting next Tuesday to review the draft Consent Order.

Mr. Travous stated that, while staff is not off the hook for this situation, it would be interesting to know when the Vice Chairman got that comment. Staff received a load of things in the mail that were sent Certified Mail. It has taken staff some time to get to the depth of this problem.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that it was well before the bigger load of mail was received. She was sent copies of some of these violations as a follow-up. In her opinion, the Board should have been notified when staff received the first one or two violations. Deaths have resulted from problems with water systems. The agency cannot be overly careful about this.

Mr. Porter stated that he tends to agree. It may be because he and Ms. Stewart have seen nightmares that have come about with entities they have been involved with because of their legal background. They may be over sensitized. He agrees with her and he really wants to know if there are citations for health issues or citations for potentials for illness (whether it's West Nile or E-bola shows up at Slide Rock). He would like to know about those things right away. The Board really are responsible and are on the hook.

Mr. Travous responded that he understood what Mr. Porter was saying. The reason staff hasn't been able to follow up on the issues at Slide Rock is because of trying to get all of this ready for response.

Mr. Porter stated that he understood that it's a terrible job. In reality, it's not so much that the Board doesn't have confidence that staff will address the issue. It's that the Board needs to know so that if something happens and someone walks up to a Board member and makes a comment like that the Board members don't look like they don't know what's going on.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that she knew for six weeks before she said anything. Quite frankly she assumed it would be on the Agenda for those two meetings and was surprised that it wasn't. It is her understanding that these are not the first violations.

Mr. Travous responded that this is also not the first time that reports have been sent to ADEQ and they misplaced them. They were sending violations for things they messed up. Another example is that the Department of Health Services sent information in on their forms and ASP got written citations by Certified Mail. At some point in time staff become immune to their heavy-handed tactics because every letter staff receives is Certified Mail.

Mr. Porter noted that he ran across this same sort of thing when he was a school board member with the issue of asbestos. The asbestos issue raised its ugly head everywhere one moved on a campus. People had to be careful when putting in a light bulb that asbestos wasn't shaken loose. There were 75 pages of forms and documents that had to be filled out to even think of doing anything. It reaches a point where there is a high level of frustration with it. It is important, however, to realize that there are some powerful watchdogs out there with a lot of ability to cause pain and embarrassment. As an agency we don't need that kind of embarrassment and pain. All the Board are saying is that they want to see the red flags when these things happen.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that the Board want to be notified. They don't expect staff to have the proposed solution; they just want a heads-up that it is going on. They don't want to come in at the tail end when it's just about cleared up.

Vice Chairman Stewart called for a recess at 12:50 p.m.

Vice Chairman Stewart reconvened the meeting at 1:12 p.m. It is noted that Mr. Cordasco left the meeting during the recess, however a quorum was maintained.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that Ms. Patty Boland, representing the Attorney General's Office, was present at the meeting to provide an overview of what is going on with the State Trust Land Reform. She added that Mr. Winkleman, who not only serves as a Parks Board member, is also the Land Commissioner. She moved to Agenda Item F.

F. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. State Land Trust Reform

Ms. Boland stated that she believed the Board was most interested in the map issue. The State Land Trust Reform is a major reform of the way the State Land Department operates. This discussion is on just a small piece of it.

Vice Chairman Stewart requested that Ms. Boland tell the Board what she believed the Board should know in the form of an overview and emphasize the things that the Board needs to know. If there are some things that the Vice Chairman read about that she feels may have a potential for Board involvement she would ask those questions.

Ms. Boland reported that, as provided for in the Enabling Act in the State Constitution, state trust land must be sold for full value at public auction. A big part of this is that the State Constitution and the Enabling Act need to be amended. The U.S. Congress must approve amendments to the State Constitution (Constitution). Some of the changes to the Constitution include establishment of a Board of Trustees of which four of the seven Trustees must be associated with the beneficiaries (primarily the schools), modification of the auction requirement in some instances, and forming partnerships with the developers in most cases, providing for sealed bids at auction. She noted that there is a big planning element that takes it beyond Growing Smarter and requires them to cull all their urban lands and establish what is conservation suitable and what is development suitable. There is an opportunity for the local communities to acquire the conservation suitable land.

Ms. Boland referred to maps of “incentive” and “option” lands. These maps were not completely up-to-date and there are some important modifications that affect ASP. The purple lands on the map are incentive (conservation) lands. Vertical development rights will be extinguished on those lands as soon as the package passes on the ballot. Incentive lands in the urban areas will be transferred to the local jurisdiction. The gold land on the maps are option lands. The local jurisdictions have the ability within a certain timeframe to be set by the Land Commissioner to acquire option lands. Unlike the incentive lands, option lands must be paid for at full value without auction.

Mr. Winkleman added that option lands can be purchased for cash or other forms of consideration as long as it is demonstrable to their Board. It could be in the form of density transfers, infrastructure agreements, or other things that communities can do. As was seen with matching funds, it is very difficult for these communities to pay for the land. It does allow other options for payment.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if the transfer to local cities or counties means that the incentive lands will not be transferred to the non-profit organizations.

Ms. Boland responded affirmatively. She stated that the urban incentive lands will go to a public entity, typically the city or county.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that one of the reasons the Board is particularly interested is that at some of the state parks state trust land is used or there is state trust land immediately adjacent and ASP has relied on that remaining open space to continue park operations.

Ms. Boland reported that in rural areas, which is typically where the Board has its parks, the incentive lands will stay in the Trust and typically will remain as grazing lands. That is what the majority of them already are. There are some exceptions. She referred to the Santa Rita Range on the maps. That piece will be transferred directly to the University of Arizona. The Centennial Forest lands will be transferred directly to Northern Arizona University. The other pieces that have direct transfers are to ASP and include the piece at Picacho Peak State Park and KCSP.

Mr. Ream asked about the piece at Oracle State Park. That piece was originally an incentive piece and is an inholding at the park approximately 80 acres in size.

Mr. Winkleman responded that that piece is not in the same classification, but it can be placed there. Unfortunately, grazing issues dominated the day regardless of the relative importance of some of these issues. There was a huge concern on the part of the grazing interests that if this land was given away grazing would immediately be eliminated. The compromise is that the really important things are taken care of. If it is an inholding piece, then it should come to ASP.

Ms. Boland added that the cattle growers did not want the incentive lands in rural areas to be transferred to state agencies. They held firm on that issue. It is written that the incentive lands may be transferred to a state agency if they are not leased for grazing purposes. That may well be true with that particular piece. It can be transferred to a state agency if it's not leased for grazing purposes.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked what happens in a situation where a rancher wants the land to be preserved and is willing to give up the grazing lease.

Mr. Winkleman responded that if a lease is given up, then it can be conveyed.

Ms. Boland added that there is also an ability in the checkerboarded areas for the Land Department to sell development rights if the fee land has a conservation easement on it.

Ms. Boland explained that a big modification is that all lands that are leased by ASP from the State Land Department have now become option lands. ASP will have the ability to purchase those lands for value but without auction. Unlike the incentive lands, the option lands can go to a state agency.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if there will be a restriction on when those lands can be purchased.

Ms. Boland responded that, unlike the urban areas where there will be a short time fuse, there is no short time fuse on the rural option lands and they won't even have a time fuse on them until they come into an urban area.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that Patagonia is one of the pieces that is included in the option lands for ASP. That is something the Board always intended to buy. She asked if there is there any prohibition against the Board buying that land earlier rather than later if it wanted to do so.

Mr. Winkleman responded that it would have to be a compelling case to the Board of Trustees.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if the Board has to wait until there is a conceptual development plan.

Mr. Winkleman responded that there is a framework that the Board will have to jump through. There cannot be too many exceptions. The long and short of it is that if ASP has money and it's land that they are leasing, then they have the right to buy them and he doesn't believe the Board of Trustees will say no.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if there would be an issue with other option lands the Board might be interested in that it is not currently leasing.

Mr. Winkleman responded that he felt that might be more difficult. He does think this will be a real opportunity over time. ASP has a chance to, assuming the legislature wants to fund it and grow it, take over stewardship of a lot of these lands. Someone needs to and it won't be the Land Department. This could be a real opportunity for ASP.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that this is something that the Board talked about at their last planning session. It was felt that this is a role that ASP should be looking at. It's not really part of the Land Department's mission to manage conservation lands. It might be more appropriate for the Board to manage some of those lands.

Mr. Winkleman responded that the Land Department has been arguing forcefully that under certain classifications, if they can't generate revenue they need a plan to dispose of them. They don't want to own them; they are not a recreational agency. They are a

trust to generate revenue for the beneficiaries. In that type of situation they will be looking for folks to take those lands off their hands.

Ms. Boland added that in the urban areas the communities have to take title or it will revert from its designation as incentive land.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if, on the incentive land where the Land Department designates someone as primary and secondary, no one takes it can the Board acquire it?

Ms. Boland responded that she did not believe there would be such an ability. They have to be planned. For instance, in the McDowells, chances are that there wouldn't be a lot of development because of the terrain.

Vice Chairman Stewart suggested a scenario where some of these incentive lands go to, say, the City of Scottsdale and 10 years later they decide they really don't want to operate this preserve and want ASP to buy it from them or take it over as a state park. She asked if there is a prohibition against that kind of transfer occurring later with incentive lands.

Ms. Boland responded that that is not really addressed. She would argue that as long as the purpose continues then a transfer would be appropriate.

Mr. Winkleman stated that he could not answer that question, either. The worst case would probably be that the Board would not be able to buy it or take legal title. The Board could probably operate it or sublease it. At a minimum, ASP could play that role.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that it occurred to her that some of these entities might take things that look good at the time but later feel they had bitten off more than they were prepared to handle.

Mr. Winkleman noted that people need to recognize that it costs money to run and maintain these places. The Land Department does not do that. If they can't perform their mission, they want them off their books. They do not want to maintain those lands.

Mr. Porter stated that his concern in this situation is how comfortable staff are that nothing has been missed. It sounded as though Mr. Winkleman was saying something like the Oracle piece could still be salvaged after this bill passed the legislature so long as it is something that is within the park that is non-grazing. His concern is if the Board is at a point where it better have made sure it knows with each and every park the specific issues and have addressed them before this gets to the legislature and before it goes through a Constitutional amendment process. He asked how comfortable staff are that, as an entity, that kind of an assessment has been performed with all of the parks so that we know what cards need to be placed on the table.

Mr. Ream responded that he believes staff have done all the assessments around the parks. No one really understood at the last meeting what incentive land meant. If the Board is going to hold title to the KCSP property and the Picacho property, the Oracle property, an inholding, should be held as well.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated Mr. Porter's issue was more to the fact that the Board has a list of properties that it hopes is definitive in terms of what it had hoped to get either

as option land or as incentive land. It is incumbent upon the Board to take the list of what it has been told would be option land and incentive land and compare it with the maps. The Board needs to know if there are any serious problems.

Mr. Porter stated that his concern really goes along the lines of whether two years down the road will there be a Board meeting where it is discovered that something should have been done relating to state lands around or in, say, Homolovi that just wasn't done. Had something been done at this point, it would significantly materially change something important at that future time. He doesn't feel personally that he has as strong a grip on this.

Vice Chairman Stewart responded that that is why the Board is having this meeting today. She has talked to the Executive Director and she would like staff to get as much information as possible, take back their list, and compare it carefully with the Land Department's information and maps and send the Board an E-mail.

Mr. Porter asked to hear from the Executive Director and staff as to what their comfort level is as to how far have we been able to go to where we really have a grip on these things. He has to rely to a certain extent upon staff's wisdom and read on this.

Mr. Travous responded that staff actually started putting lists together of state lands the agency would like to own four or five years ago – before this ever started. Those lists were transferred to those who were doing the negotiating (Ms. Boland and Mr. Winkleman). This list still represents staff's priorities. Staff need to review the maps, understand exactly where they are now, and let the Board know their comfort level. Part of that comfort is understanding that they have done all they can do and knowing that there is flexibility to change a problem if something is seen in the future. Staff cannot tell the Board that today, but would be prepared to tell the Board at the May meeting if staff are comfortable and before May if there are major issues.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that the Board needs to know before the meeting. She does not want to get to the meeting and have it presented to her that day. The Board needs to receive something in writing that adds the lands that have been designated to this. The Board needs that information as quickly as possible so they know where things stand. The Board will be asked to take a position on this issue and it is important that this be such that the Board can give its support. The legislature is doing a bit of fine tinkering and she does not know that the Board wants to go hat in hand to the legislature.

Mr. Winkleman stated that ASP staff can come to the Land Department and sit down with their staff and review the maps.

Ms. Boland explained how these maps were developed. The Land Department really just facilitated the process because they have the equipment. It was primarily the conservation community and the beneficiaries sitting in a room discussing the lands (that's too valuable; you can't have that; or yes, we recognize that's conservation value and won't ever be developed anyway). For instance, Patagonia was discussed at every meeting. The beneficiaries said they were making money on Patagonia and questioned why it would be made incentive if they were making money on it. There were things

she would have put on the maps or not put on the maps, but it really was the conservation community and the beneficiaries.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that this actually started in Proposition 100 where The Nature Conservancy got all of the different conservation organizations together. They brought all of those maps together. That's when ASP first submitted their map. Her understanding is that those maps were taken as a starting point with pieces added and subtracted.

Ms. Boland agreed.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that that Board has been involved to some extent but has not been as high a priority in the last six months or more as it would have liked.

Mr. Winkleman noted that, from a timing standpoint, now is the time for the Board to act. This bill will be done before the next Board meeting. He suggested that Mr. Travous coordinate with him to get his staff to sit down with ASP staff to go through the data in detail.

Mr. Travous noted that the change that allows the Board to buy those lands at Sonoita without having to go to bid is great. That is what was keeping the agency from being able to buy the land. Staff had no concept of what was going to happen had they been put out for bids and then lost to a higher bidder. From that perspective it was better to do nothing. The agency is in a much better position now to say it is conservation land, this is what it's worth, and we will gather up the money without having to go out to bid.

Mr. Winkleman agreed that that was the right thing to do and believes that the beneficiaries recognized it as well. In Patagonia, for example, not only did they get the option classification for the land that's being leased, but they got them to connect what ASP already has downstream at Sonoita Creek that is not being leased. There is a block of parkland there, assuming the Board can buy it.

Mr. Porter stated that he is comfortable with most of what he has seen. His only concern was that there is something that is being missed.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated she felt the same and that is why it is important to have it in writing in the next few days so that it is not just a verbal statement that everything is ok.

Mr. Travous responded that staff will get back with the Board next week.

Mr. Ream added that the reform will change the whole process so that if there are lands that were not identified this time out, there is a way to try to acquire them.

Mr. Porter asked if this is a "name it now or lose it" proposition.

Ms. Boland responded that the beneficiaries felt strongly that this is a one-time "land grab". They have put into the law that there will be no more free land for 25 years. The question remains as to what happens if the voters say in five years they want more free land. She doesn't know if that's effective. The beneficiaries do, however, feel strongly that they are getting enough in the planning pieces.

Mr. Porter stated his concern is now zero. It's not so much the issue of these incentive lands that the Board can buy. It is great to be able to do that. He is concerned about the fact that there may be parcels out there tucked away that really ought to be included along with the Oracle piece. If there is something out there that is significant and should be considered, Mr. Winkleman is saying the Board had better let him know now.

Mr. Winkleman noted that ASP staff put a lot of detail in the sheets that they prepared and distributed in January. In comparison to most of the other groups, they were pretty well represented. The exercise has been gone through with the staff doing the maps. He doesn't believe anything major will be found. This is the time to revisit it.

Mr. Porter noted that when he began this dialogue his first words were "what is our comfort level". He is beginning to hear that the comfort level is high. Staff really are comfortable that a hard look has been taken at each and every park and that they were put under a microscope to the point that staff know their bid has been put out for those things that are really needed in the park system.

Mr. Travous responded that he believed staff's comfort level is high, but it can be discussed one more time.

Ms. Boland noted the Mr. Winkleman has offered his staff to assist ASP staff. They can project all of these maps. Sitting with them will be a benefit.

Mr. Winkleman noted that it is fairly easy to do. ASP staff have already zeroed in. He suggested that staff just double-check things. They have been dealing with a lot of things and it is not inconceivable that something was missed. He believes that, all in all, ASP has really come out of this very well and has a chance to really increase the state parks system over time because of what has been put in place.

Ms. Boland added that land that is suitable for mitigation under federal law can be leased or sold without auction.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked who would actually do the leasing and who would manage it. If a development was going in and someone wanted to disturb habitation in one area and purchased another area. Would they hold it and manage it or would this be an opportunity for the Board.

Ms. Boland responded that it could be done many different ways. Many times they will purchase it but then contract with someone else to operate or manage it.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if that could be a long-term lease for a park.

Mr. Winkleman responded that the Land Department has authorized 99-year mitigation leases. This is another area ASP may benefit from.

Ms. Boland added that it would have to be consistent with the purpose of the mitigation. Another piece relates to the Growing Smarter money. They have always talked about making those moneys available to the communities for the purchase of option lands. While there will be no more API, they want the funds to continue. ASP would still have granting authority for those moneys. It is just what would be available for purchase that would change. They are hopeful that those moneys will survive.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that it sounds like option lands the Board wishes to purchase can't just be purchased whenever the Board wants to unless the Board is not currently leasing them. It might actually be more difficult to get those lands if the Trustees didn't feel it was the right thing to do.

Ms. Boland pointed out that as long as it is rural the Board will retain it.

Mr. Winkleman added that the Board is protected. The thing about the option lands is that the Land Department couldn't sell them for any other purpose without first offering them up for conservation purposes.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if the Land Department had some option lands and wasn't ready to sell them and they were not currently being grazed could the Board enter into a long-term lease for a park before they became suitable to sell.

Mr. Winkleman responded that the Board could probably lease them for a park even if they were being grazed. It would probably be a higher use. The Land Department retains the ability to reclassify the land.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that leasing would not run into as many problems with having to jump through all the hoops with the cities and counties on the conceptual use plans.

Mr. Winkleman responded that they have overlaid this conceptual planning to ensure the Trust is protected. He can't say the Board wouldn't have to jump through hoops. There is an intensity or lack of intensity depending on the characteristics of the area. The key will be to convince the Board of Trustees to go along with it. He suspected that if ASP came in and said here's land that's designated as conservation, it's part of the park, it fits well, we have money, we're ready to give it to you the Board of Trustees would have a difficult time saying no.

Ms. Boland noted that there was a debate where people walked away from the table a few weeks ago. The question was whether or not to voter protect the statutes. Almost everyone at the table said no. The conservationists wanted voter protection for the statutes. The compromise was to take what they really needed from the statutes and put it in the Constitution. The point is that in the future, if things are not working or if something can be done better, as long as it's consistent with the Constitution the ability to do so will be there.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that a couple of these provisions refer to option lands not being purchased during the option period and notice would then be given to ASP and the Game and Fish Commission. She asked if that was with the hope that the Board or Commission would be interested in purchasing it.

Mr. Winkleman responded that he assumed that to be the case. He believed that people recognized that ASP and Game and Fish might be good candidates for this because of the Heritage Fund.

Ms. Boland added that state agencies are qualified parties to acquire option lands. There is a potential for the Board to acquire some city parks.

Vice Chairman Stewart reported that on the definition of vertical development, she wanted to ensure that the Board is OK in that there could be the normal things like a visitors center. She asked if there would be a problem with ranger residences. There are ranger residences at most of the parks now.

Mr. Winkleman responded that these are the things that can be discussed offline. It is an important issue. He made a fairly big deal out of it after personally visiting Patagonia. That park has a small convenience store. This process cannot be made so that it breaks things apart. They tried to list the obvious and have a catchall. He hopes that ranger residences would fall in that catchall.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted the possibility of ASP managing some of the land before it is sold. She asked about where ASP may not want to take it over as a park but the Land Department does not want to manage the land. Would the Land Department be interested in paying someone to manage it.

Mr. Winkleman responded negatively.

Ms. Boland noted that the Land Department would be allowed to use Trust proceeds to fund the Land Department.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that her questions have all been answered and asked if there was anything else that the Land Commissioner thought the Board should know.

Mr. Winkleman responded that he felt that all the high points had been covered. In summary he stated that he believes that while this is critically important to the Land Department, in looking at other groups and agencies that this benefits it is a tremendous boost and opportunity for ASP. He is optimistic that this will go through within the next few weeks. If that happens, the Land Department will come back and request the Board's endorsement.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that this issue should be on the Agenda for the May meeting.

Mr. Winkleman stated he would like to have some sort of program with ASP where we are out spreading the word and encouraging people to support it.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that some of the things that were clarified today make it a lot easier for the Board to move into that kind of role. It isn't just that the Board is able to buy the lands the agency is currently leasing but that there is a potential for the Board to acquire some of these other lands without having to compete with some development project for future parks.

Mr. Winkleman noted that it may make sense to have an ASP position paper that could be distributed in support of it. There will be a huge outreach educational effort.

Ms. Boland noted that she could see a partnership on the mitigation. The Land Department would be making the money and ASP would be managing it.

Mr. Winkleman noted that the Land Department will not want to manage those lands and it might be a very nice fit with ASP.

Mr. Travous noted that ASP staff have been putting things together behind the scenes over a series of years. He thanked Ms. Boland and Mr. Winkleman for their tremendous patience with the hard-fought battles and the battle to get it passed.

Ms. Boland reported that if they are not done within the next week-and-a-half to two weeks the legislature may not be interested in looking at it.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked where the Governor stood on this.

Ms. Boland responded that the Governor is supportive.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Winkleman and Ms. Boland did a lot of advocacy on the Board's behalf. She expressed the Board's and staff's appreciation.

Vice Chairman Stewart moved to the Agenda item regarding the Mabery issue.

J. PARKS

1. Section report

Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation

Ms. Hernbrode stated that there was no need for Executive Session on this issue. She reported that we are going forward to trial. There have been no new Settlement offers from the Maberys. There has been involvement in Discovery issues. There will be a Status Hearing on Monday at which time legal staff hope to resolve some Discovery issues and/or postpone the trial in order to get some of their damage materials.

Mr. Travous noted that staff have received a letter from the Attorney General's Office to outside counsel regarding whether the Risk Management portion of the Attorney General's Office should cover this litigation.

Ms. Hernbrode explained that typically Risk Management covers tort claims litigation for the state. They would cover something like where, while driving a state vehicle, a state employee rear-ends someone. There are some very novel issues in this litigation. Because the Risk Management section is already representing and ASP is already representing, they contracted it out to determine coverage – which portion is Risk Management and which portion is ASP. She advocated that the entire litigation be Risk Management.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that she was surprised that Risk Management jumped into it.

H. ADMINISTRATION

1. Section report

Concession Update

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Arizona State Parks Board authorize the Executive Director or his designee to enter into negotiations and award contracts for concession services at Lyman Lake State Park.

Mr. Winkleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chairman Stewart called for a recess so the Board and staff could have lunch at 2:00 p.m.

Vice Chairman Stewart reconvened the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that at the January meeting the Board authorized staff to pursue agreements on Alamo Lake, Lake Havasu, and KCSP. Since that time the Lyman Lake concessionaire decided to not renew his contract. The motion just before lunch was to allow staff to pursue a concession contract for Lyman Lake. The RFP will go out tomorrow. Proposals to the RFP should be back by April 1. There were some very good people who showed up at Lake Havasu. There are some people who are interested in Alamo. Staff are reviewing drafts for the KCSP proposal. That concession does not expire until November.

Financial Report

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that it is her understanding that staff don't know a lot more than at the last Board meeting.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that attendance is down about 2%; revenues are up about 17%. There was concern earlier in the year that the park system would only make \$8.5 million of the \$10.5 million needed to break even. Based on the last couple of months, we may see \$9 million. Staff have been watching expenditures very closely. It may be possible to save about \$1 million.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that in February KCSP was 95.4% sold out. That figure includes both rooms. In the first couple of months staff were concerned about cannibalization. However, it now looks very strong. The Big Room is sold out. The only concern is if the Throne Room/Rotunda Room sales drop off in May and June. RAM has been working on some marketing for that eventuality. Based on what was seen at Dead Horse, and hopefully at Picacho and Lost Dutchman, it should be a big spring. The sites at Dead Horse have filled up, and that's been very good news.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that the SLIF and OHV are gas tax dependent. It's hard to predict what will happen with the recent rise in gasoline prices. There will be enough money to pay the sweeps in June for both OHV and SLIF. He was hoping to have a little overlap.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that the Pubs Fund is doing well. It is up 15% and expected to finally hit \$400,000. It has been running at about \$330,000 over the past three years. Staff are hopeful that next year it will actually crack the \$500,000 mark.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that the way the Reservation Surcharge is appropriated the agency can spend up to \$293,700. Anything above that can only be spent with JLBC review. Staff may bring forward a proposal in May for equipment to expand the Reservation System and do some infrastructure in preparation for an operational reservation system in 2005. Staff will need Board approval before going before the JLBC for that.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that the Heritage Fund Interest is of concern. Two or three years ago the agency made \$1.8 million. This year it may only be \$550,000. Staff are trying to pull expenditures back from that. Spending is at about 80%.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that the Board received a couple of paragraphs from Mr. Ziemann giving them a preview of his report. She felt that was very helpful. It would be helpful for the Board to receive an E-mail on the financial side a few days before the Board meetings. It is helpful for those Board members who don't work with financials every day.

Mr. Porter noted that it doesn't have to be complicated.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that he would be able to do that. One of the problems with the accounting structure is that sometimes the information has to be faxed to him the day of the meeting in order to be able to give current reports.

J. PARKS

1. Section report

Proposed State Park Fees Revisions

Ms. Hawks reported that a fee consultant was hired and took staff through a process to develop a fee philosophy. Staff who went through this process included those from the field who work with the visitors who come in to the parks. The fee philosophy is based on a pyramid with the bottom level having the greatest community benefit and the top having the most individual benefit with a spectrum between. The fee philosophy is: To provide a quality sustainable state park system for this and future generations Arizona State Parks will collect fair and equitable user fees to augment other revenues. The Smart Fee Team from Project 11 is a cross-divisional team including staff from Operations, Admin, the field, Public Information Office, and Research and Marketing.

Ms. Hawks referred to a slide depicting the agency's current fee schedule (a copy of which was included in the Board packet). The committee met more than 20 times over the last 18 months. The Board has already approved both the Annual Pass and the KCSP fees. However, KCSP's busy season is being addressed as part of the new fee schedule. Essentially the Smart Fee Team took the current fee schedule and went park-by-park comparing them with the pyramid in the fee philosophy to see if the fees being charged were appropriate. The team came up with a two-page fee schedule, also included in the Board packet. The new fee schedule is more complicated because of the number of issues that had to be dealt with because of the fee philosophy such as whether or not to charge resident/non-resident fees. Almost everyone said they would retire or hang themselves if the agency went to resident/non-resident fees because all visitors would be required to show their driver's licenses at the gate. There was a 3 1/2 hours discussion one day as to what a tow vehicle is.

Mr. Porter noted that the Board members all received this information and have had the opportunity to review it. He stated that he has one issue with the whole process that he would like to raise. He has held back in the past because he was fairly new to the Board.

Mr. Porter stated that he has a major problem with charging for children under a much higher age than 7 at historic parks. He believes that the prime zone for them to be exposed is that early age group into the early teens (7-13). He would even be comfortable with a higher age, but the fee schedule currently breaks it at age 14 and he can live with that. He stated that he would like to eliminate charging fees at the historic parks for that category of 7-13 with the exception of Riordan Mansion which has a tour-specific fee involved. He understands there is probably reason enough to charge the \$2.50 fee at Riordan. He would also agree with retaining the group discounts at Riordan. However, he would get rid of the whole 7-13 discount category at the other historic parks.

Mr. Porter stated that he believes that at the historic parks it is vital to attract every possible child and we shouldn't do anything that even remotely discourages a parent from bringing a child along. There's not a huge amount of money involved. He believes that there is a benefit in giving that fee up and making a very clear loud policy to the parents that we want their children at these historic parks and that they won't be charged until they are 14. He realizes that the Board is not in a position to make a motion on this issue today, but if the will of the Board is to proceed in that fashion he assumes that is what staff will do.

Ms. Hawks responded that the historic parks were grouped together on the old fee schedule. The grouping with all the historic parks also includes a park that is not considered a historic park. This is a grouping of parks where the fee is charged "per individual" rather than by vehicle. Therefore, Tonto Natural Bridge is included with a \$2 charge for 7-13 years of age.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that there is no charge at any of the recreational parks for children under 14. She does not know that there would be a rational basis to single out Tonto. They can recreate at all the other parks for free; they can go to the historic parks for free; but they have to pay for Tonto because of the tours. She believes that should be eliminated, too.

Mr. Porter noted that he had missed that, but that Ms. Stewart had convinced him.

Ms. Hawks responded that the team did have this discussion at one point. The KCSP fees were approved in July 2003 and includes the three age ranges.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that is different – it's a tour.

Ms. Hawks agreed and noted that the Fee Team was concerned that it would be confusing if other parks had a different age range. They were trying to be consistent.

Mr. Porter responded that he could understand that, and he likes consistency ordinarily. But not when there's a reason to deviate. In this case, he is only zeroing in on the historic parks, although Tonto is included in that grouping.

Mr. Beechum noted that he remembered a previous discussion the Board had about charging a nominal fee. When it says "free" it takes away from the value of a product. He knows from experience with his organization that when, say a teen dance, is free it seems like the importance of the event drops. Even if the fee is just \$1 it seems to have

value and draws more interest. Remembering the discussion back then with the Smart Fees Team, he believed that was part of the philosophy.

Mr. Porter responded that that could be. But in the example just given, that is probably a situation where the teens are paying for the event themselves. In this particular case it's more likely that we are really talking about inducing families to come and bring their children. If we are charging for the adults and not the children below the age of 14, it encourages them to perhaps be more willing to bring those children. Otherwise they may feel that the children might not get that much out of it and pass it up. It's a gut feeling he has and something that he happens to feel very strongly about.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated her concern about giving a message that the Board believes it is of community benefit to let children in free at the recreational parks but for some reason they will be charged at the historic parks where there is an educational opportunity. She noted that a vehicle at the recreational parks is defined as four adults and an unlimited number of children. Children are not being counted in cars. Why would we count them at historic parks? We're having a terrible time getting people to go to the historic parks. She noted a Board member made a comment a few meetings ago that if youth don't really get into going to parks when they are young, they don't really appreciate them when they are older. We are struggling with trying to get Arizona residents to stand behind the parks.

Mr. Beechum noted that he had made that remark, and he still feels that way. But he is not sure how eliminating the fees we are charging will eliminate that problem.

Vice Chairman Stewart responded that if one looks at how much it costs a family of 2 adults (\$3 or \$4 each) and add another \$1 per child, it adds up to where they may decide to go somewhere else instead.

Mr. Beechum asked if the fees charged at the historic parks go back into those parks or offset an event being held within those parks.

Vice Chairman Stewart responded that the fees go back into the system.

Mr. Porter noted that this would not preclude a special event or program. They are a separate charge. This would just be the admission into the park.

Mr. Beechum responded that it would be nice if that admission fee would go back into the historic park to help with their events.

Mr. Travous noted that the fees help the bottom line and reminded the Board that the agency is bottom-line driven. He does not know how much impact those fees would cause. If we are going to do that, he would prefer that staff have the opportunity to market the fact that it was done. The fee can always be removed at a later time. It is easier to take a fee away than it is to add it later.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that as a Board member she is uncomfortable having this schedule sent out as what the Board is proposing. She feels strongly about that. She understands that the agency will lose a few dollars on this, but she feels there is a good chance that dollars will be gained in the long run by having more adults coming into those parks.

Mr. Travous responded that his point is not about the money at all. His point is to the marketing aspect. If we're going to do it we might get more bang out of our bucks if the agency has a chance to say "State Parks Board decides to eliminate" these fees.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if staff would like a motion to that fact today rather than sending it out with the fee schedule.

Mr. Travous responded that the Operations staff have done all the work behind this.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that she wasn't sure what staff is suggesting. She is asking for clarification.

Mr. Travous responded that his clarification is that if the charging age is 7-13 and if the Board is going to drop it, then the marketing staff and Public Information Officer need to be involved so that the agency gets some "pop" out of it in the media to let people know we are not charging those children fees at historic parks.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if that should be done in addition since the Board is not taking action today to make elimination of the fee effective today. She believes the Board is saying that the Board want it to go out without a fee for children as the Board's proposal.

Mr. Porter added that, in reality, if the Board chooses not to eliminate those fees then in all honesty staff will hear him coming back in and suggesting that the Board seriously look then at providing a certain amount of equality across-the-board and start to charge for ages 7 and older at the recreational parks. He sees a lesser argument for not charging them than for charging children at the historic parks.

Mr. Travous responded that it is his understanding that they were not separated out because they were historic parks but rather because this is where individual fees are charged. That's why Tonto is included in that grouping.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that there is a definition for a vehicle and a vehicle does not include the children but only counts the adults. It is not unlimited people in the vehicle; it's four adults and unlimited children.

Mr. Porter stated that he feels very strongly about that. When this comes back to the Board for approval down the road, if that charge for children 7-13 is included he will probably not vote for approval.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated she will not vote to support it either.

Mr. Winkleman noted that the Board is assuming that the revenue impact is minimal. He asked if staff know for sure what it will be.

Mr. Travous responded that staff cannot answer that at this time.

Mr. Siegwarth added that it might help to sit back for a second. Ms. Hawks is trying to get a process through. The changes the Board want to make may depend on what part of the process to change insofar as marketing it.

Mr. Siegwarth stated that he quickly added up some figures. These parks, even though they include Tonto, roughly make \$1 million (\$928,000). He doesn't know how much of that is children versus adults. Ft. Verde makes \$30,000-\$37,000 a year; McFarland is

\$7,000; Tubac is \$35,000; Yuma Crossing is \$30,000; Yuma Territorial Prison is \$205,000; Tonto is \$165,000; Tombstone is \$176,000; and Jerome is \$165,000. He has to believe the majority of those are adult parks. However, he does not have a breakdown or statistics with him to say that for certain. RAM has profiles from those parks from Visitor Surveys they have conducted. That information can be extrapolated.

Mr. Porter stated that he would be interested in seeing that information fairly soon.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that she did not believe data is kept on how many of the fees are children versus adults.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that he believes, in fact, that we do. It is a different key on the cash register. He believes that staff can get the information on how many visitors were children.

Mr. Ream reminded the Board that this is a draft fee schedule.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that it is the Board's fee schedule. It is being presented to the public as what the Board is proposing and she is very much against sending it out this way. If there is evidence later that is overwhelming that there will be a major financial impact, then she would rather look at trying to make it up somewhere else.

Mr. Porter stated his agreement.

Mr. Travous asked if staff should still send it out.

Mr. Ream stated that staff will change it.

Ms. Hawks stated that staff can take those prices out for ages 7-13 and make 7-13 free in that group of parks.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that then all of the parks except the two parks that have tours will be free up to age 14.

Ms. Hawks asked if the Board wants to leave the 7-13 fee in for Riordan Mansion.

Vice Chairman Stewart responded affirmatively. That is because they take a slot on the tour that cannot be sold.

Mr. Beechum stated that he agrees, but he remembers the discussion on charging a nominal fee. It is a psychological thing about charging that \$1. The Fee Team's philosophy is more of a psychological thing like charging \$1.95 instead of \$2 or \$2.95 instead of \$3. He noted that he will be taking youngsters to Red Rock and Slide Rock and from a recreational standpoint it's much easier not having a fee because he can figure out how much it will cost for gas, etc.

Mr. Porter pointed out that at those parks there won't be a fee for the children.

Mr. Beechum agreed that it will be a lot easier to do that.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that that was one of the issues that was raised. She went to a couple of the meetings and the consultants talked about doing some things for free because of greater community benefit as opposed to the individual benefit. This may fall into educating youth.

Mr. Travous noted that Tonto is a nice place for parents to take their children for a day.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that she believes it is important to separate out the cabin fees from the yurt fees simply because the yurt fees are a lot cheaper. By lumping them together there is a very large range of \$35-\$75. She is not suggesting changing the fees. She understands that the fees for cabins start at a higher range. She would like them separated out to whatever the actual fees are. She believes more people will make reservations if they have a better idea of what the cost is.

Ms. Hawks responded that it just ended up that way on the schedule because it is only the second fee schedule. Staff did not know what the fees would be when the schedule was printed.

Mr. Ream noted that Ms. Hawks has put a great deal of time in this process. The meetings were long and tedious. A great deal of her time went into going through all of the fees. Getting all the team members to agree was a great deal. Some of the team members are very excited about the new fees and are asking when they can change their signs.

Mr. Ream added that, all that being said, he is sure there are mistakes in this. Staff are receiving a lot of phone calls on the Annual Passes. Staff will go out to the communities after this meeting, take a proposed fee schedule that may look a little different because of the Board's requests today, have a redline copy made from this copy and bring it back to the Board for approval. The Board may or may not take the public's opinion. The public may want a better value than the Board is willing to offer because it is not affordable. That's where it will be very tough for the Board to make that decision. The public hearings will not be much fun for staff, either.

Mr. Beechum asked how the Park Rangers feel about these fees and whether they would be for free admittance for children under a certain age as this Board discussed. He recalls that there were discussions about some of that money going back to their own facilities. He asked if there is a psychological thing that by not charging a fee they will get less at their park.

Mr. Ream responded that the parks have been charging that fee for a couple of years now (7-13) at the historic parks. Staff will have the information for the Board before the next Board meeting, even with the public input, as to how much money is being talked about. He does not believe it will be a great amount. He thinks it's a great gesture; he agrees with the Executive Director that there is a marketing opportunity there. If the fees are erased for that age group, he believes that particularly the legislators need to be informed that the Board has done this for the children.

Mr. Porter stated that he is 100% for that because that is the whole impact of what he was saying. We want to attract children at a young age. We can gain some traffic that way.

Mr. Ream stated that he believes the Park Rangers have strong feelings about the fees they charge. He believes they are very proud of the product that they deliver at their parks. He believes that just showing it off is important to them; the fee is just something they have to do for the Phoenix Office. He doesn't believe that they will mind that it's eliminated.

Mr. Porter stated that he heard a complaint at Roper Lake State Park that they were unhappy about the fees because, by comparison to a few state parks just over boundary to New Mexico that are competitors, they were charging less and detected that we were losing business to them from people in that area who had been coming to Roper but now found they could go across the boundary into New Mexico cheaper. His only response to that complaint was that unfortunately the Board really has to have some logical sense with what we are marketing. That's really the only feedback from the Park Rangers that he has received that was at all negative. It was not given in a negative fashion; it was simply given as a fact that it is probably costing them a little bit of business. The people have realized by comparing rates that they can get a better deal in New Mexico.

Ms. Hawks noted that the Park Managers were given quite a few opportunities to provide feedback, and that was not the feedback she had heard. When the fee philosophy was given there were Park Managers at both ends of the spectrum. Some thought we should do everything for free, which is something that we can't do even if we want to now. There were others at the other end who thought we should charge for everything that the travelers could bear. She believes we are in the middle. Staff have never received complaints about charges for children's fees. In fact, when we started charging for educational programs for children teachers came to her and said, "It's about time." She believes the reason those fees were put on the schedule was to keep things consistent and they didn't feel that people thought it was a burden.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that the Board believes the educational fees for the programs are good.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that she has one other thing to discuss and that she is not insisting that it be changed at this point. Staff might want to consider lowering the fee at Yuma. She believes the offering at Yuma is very similar to Ft. Verde.

Ms. Hawks responded that staff talked about that. She will go back and check her files.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that she believes Yuma is overpriced. It's not really a fair offering with the state of the exhibits today. It has a lot of potential. The offering at Jerome compared with Yuma Crossing are quite different.

Mr. Porter noted that the Arizona Historical Society started charging admission at their museums within the last year or so. They are now charging fees at their museum in Yuma which is kind of a third of the trio of historic points in Yuma. He wondered what they are charging and whether it is higher or lower than where we are. It strikes him that there might be something to be said for some consistency in what is being charged among those three.

Ms. Hawks responded that she would be happy to investigate that. She noted that she has actually received calls from the Historical Society asking how ASP structured its fees.

E. PARTNERSHIPS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

1. Section report

Legislative Report

Mr. Ziemann reported that the legislature is approaching its 70th day in session and still hasn't done much. They have not touched the Land Trust Reform, and that is beginning to be problematic. They have not really touched the budget yet.

Mr. Ziemann noted that he provided the Board with a summary sheet of Regular Session 2004 Bills a week or so ago. Not much has changed. He noted that a lot of the bills are now dead. That is because deadlines have passed for the Senate and the House to hear bills. He reminded the Board that although the numbers may be dead, the language can always come back in some form during the session.

Mr. Ziemann noted that SB 1320 is the Disabled Veterans bill. That bill is dead. The agency has instituted an administrative program where an Annual Pass is being set up for the 100% disabled veterans. About 60 have applied for those passes to date.

Mr. Ziemann noted that SB 1039, Military Base Preservation, is \$14.3 million that would come out of the Land Conservation Fund. They were to debate that bill in the Committee of the Whole (COW) today. He believes that will die in COW.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if the Board needs to take any action to ensure that it does die.

Mr. Ziemann responded that staff are taking action on the Board's behalf to counsel the legislators on those kinds of things. He believes we are all right.

Mr. Ziemann noted that HB 2307, the Fire Districts bill, got held yesterday in Senate Appropriations. He believes that bill will die as well.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked about the bills regarding State Employee Raises.

Mr. Ziemann responded that he does not believe either of those bills will go through. He does believe it will be in a proposal in the budget (especially on the Governor's side), but he does not believe that the bills themselves will go anywhere.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated her appreciation in receiving the E-mails on these bills.

Mr. Porter noted that the information is very helpful. It keeps the Board informed. He appreciates receiving it.

2004 State Lake Improvement Grant Cycle

Mr. Ziemann reported that the Board packet contains information on what the expedited SLIF grant cycle will look like. Approximately \$1.47 million is coming back from the FY 2001 Lake Havasu City acquisition project. A grant workshop was held at the Phoenix Office on March 10, 2004 and more than 20 applicants attended and are very interested in applying for this grant money.

Mr. Ziemann added that earlier in the week Lake Havasu called the SLIF Grant Coordinator to inform her that they are likely to not apply for this money.

Mr. Porter asked if they gave the slightest inclination as to why they may not apply.

Mr. Ziemann responded negatively. He stated they said they wanted to keep staff informed.

Mr. Porter noted he got two inquiries of great interest. He can't imagine they wouldn't continue to have great interest if they weren't going to apply. He was told as recently

as a week ago that they were interested. They noted that when the call went out to applicants it had the tag on it of the policy of no more than 20%. They asked if that meant that they simply cannot apply for anything more than 20%. His response to them was that if he were they, he would apply for whatever they want to go for. It's ultimately up to the Board how it applies that 20% cap. It could, in fact, it turn out that they are the only applicant. He is fascinated that they are not applying.

Mr. Ziemann responded that they may yet apply. They called staff last week to say they were not going to apply.

2. Vital Statistics – Employee Survey

Mr. Ziemann reported that information was included in the Board packet. He does not have a lot to add.

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that she reviewed last year's survey because there was concern about the communication area. Specifically, where employees expressed the most concern was the question of there being effective communication channels available in the agency to communicate employee concerns. The employees were under the perception that they were not being heard. More employees either disagreed or strongly disagreed than who either agreed or strongly agreed. That particular question stood out even though the whole area of Communication was weak. It concerned her that this survey focused not on the fact that the employees were saying they were not being heard but on how they want to get information from management. She was concerned that employees may feel that they still have not been heard. They are being asked how they want to receive more information from management. Additionally, the ability of the employees to give narrative responses to the survey was eliminated. That part concerned her a little. She knows that Ms. Hawks has been going out to the parks and meeting with park staff. She believes that that has been having a positive effect. Having been a state employee herself, she understands staff are asked to fill out these surveys and many times the reason they are not filled out is because the feeling is why fill them out when they haven't been listened to the last time they filled it out. She realizes that the employees were concerned to some extent about not being kept informed; however, the highest concern was that they are not being listened to. She expressed her disappointment that that issue was not addressed. She believes it is very good that Ms. Hawks is going out to the field, but perhaps something needs to be done at the Phoenix Office along those lines, too. She believes it is important that employees feel that management does care what they have to say and that there are avenues of communication available to them. She is not saying those avenues do not exist; last year's survey indicates that the employees' perception is that there is a problem with the Board and Executive Staff listening to them. She noted that Ms. Hawks related to her that one of the comments she got when she met with some of the employees was that they thought it would just be another meeting but she really did come and really did listen to what they had to say and had feedback for them. She believes that is helpful and more of that sort of thing that can be done, the better.

G. FRIENDS RAISING/FUNDRAISING

1. Section report – Report on Activities of Executive Consultant

Ms. Statler reported that she has spent the past several weeks becoming familiar with the agency's structure and staff. She visited 14 parks in two months. She spent time researching Friends Group Development inside and outside of Arizona. There are many examples of Friends development in state parks around the country and just about as many variations on that theme. The one consistent thread is certainly the case for soliciting additional public support – the justification beyond the government model.

Ms. Statler noted that in her early discussions with the Executive Director they discussed the case statement. The Director quoted Dr. Wilbur LePage, former Parks Director at New Hampshire State Parks: "A park without friends cannot survive. It has no soul, no front line of defense." As was noted earlier in the day, volunteers are an important aspect of park operations. However, an organized body of volunteers can become fierce advocates and that first line of defense that is so desperately needed here in Arizona.

Ms. Statler reported that, with the support of a knowledgeable Board of Directors that includes Ms. Pfister, Mr. Frank Long, Mr. Carl Knasek, Ms. Sheri Graham, Mr. Ron Pies, Ms. Celeste Hamilton, Mr. Bill Rowe, Mr. Richard Simms, and tentatively Ms. Karen English, we are moving forward with the organization of the Arizona State Parks Foundation. It will be a 501 c (3) charitable organization with the mission to stand as the partner needed by Arizona State Parks to fulfill its mission through education, community participation, and financial support. Incorporation papers are being filed, and they are in the planning process.

Ms. Statler added that during her visits to the parks and in discussions with Park Managers, she has encouraged them to consider the implications of friends organizations at their parks. It is not always easy and it involves a time commitment from the Park Managers as well to explore the interest of friends and volunteers in this endeavor.

Ms. Statler reported that Red Rock has formed a Benefactors group. It is a pending 501 c (3) that is moving forward. There is also interest in this early exploration process from Sonoita Creek Natural Area and Riordan Mansion. There is interest from Park Managers, and staff believe there is interest in the communities. There are far reaching benefits of this strong advocacy that can be created through a Friends organization and a Foundation, and certainly that is volunteer support. It even reaches beyond that to being a vehicle in the future of getting the word out. It could be a network – a database – of friends who will be strong advocates for the mission of the parks over the long term.

Ms. Statler stated that the next steps include continuing to meet with the Foundation. They have not yet convened for the first time, but they are all affirmed participants and are knowledgeable. There is a depth of knowledge and passion in this group. She believes very strongly that things are on the right path. She is eager to move forward with this endeavor.

Mr. Porter suggested that this would be a good vehicle to draw in all of the past members of this Board as they leave service. His guess is that, on average, they have developed strong interest and supportive reactions to ASP by the end of their six-year

terms. Then, all of a sudden, they are gone. This would be a nice place to quietly shunt each retiring Board member into some kind of an emeritus relationship with this organization. It would not necessarily be sitting on the Foundation's Board itself. But as an emeritus advisor or perhaps form a Past Director's Advisory Commission that could be an adjunct to them and act as a sounding board or participate in pushing specific projects throughout the state. It strikes him as a good way to keep those "hands" interested.

Ms. Statler noted that many of the names on the Foundation's Board will be familiar to the Board.

Ms. Porter suggested seriously looking at making it a policy that when someone leaves this Board at least they will be offered that avenue of continued service and be drawn into that group.

Mr. Travous responded that he serves as Communications Liaison to that group and will communicate Mr. Porter's suggestion to them.

Vice Chairman Stewart asked if the Foundation has any legal relationship with the Board.

Ms. Statler responded that their relationship is only to support.

Vice Chairman Stewart requested a copy of their Mission Statement.

Mr. Porter noted that the suggestion he just made is something that comes right from the Rotary Club. They have a Past District Governors Advisory Committee that past District Governors automatically become a part of.

L. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that the next meeting will be on May 20, 2004 in Prescott, Arizona. She spoke with Mr. Cordasco about changing the meeting time to 9:00 a.m. Since the next two meetings are near his home 9:00 would be fine.

K. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE, REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

Vice Chairman Stewart noted that the Board has already requested the Peck's Lake and the State Trust Land Reform items be placed on the May Agenda. The State Trust Land Reform needs to be an Action Item so that the Board can take action to support that effort.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that it would be helpful at either the next meeting or the meeting in July for Mr. Ream to update the Board as to the status of use of motors on Patagonia Lake. No fancy PowerPoint presentations are necessary; the Board is just looking for progress on that issue.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that she is still hoping to get the Board policies from staff. The packet the Board received does not include a lot of the things referred to in meetings. The information the Board received includes information from 1976 and 2000. When buildings are built on parks there are policies. There are policies on grants that are not included in the information they received.

Vice Chairman Stewart stated that at some point there needs to be a discussion on changes to the grant extension policy in order to avoid the kind of problem the Board encountered with Pima County so that if an applicant does not comply 70% time then any extension request would have to come before the Board. Part of that problem was that the Board never knew the applicants weren't complying; staff probably did not know that the Board wanted to know that. They had received extensions three or four times when they had not been doing anything and all of a sudden staff said they didn't like this and it became a major issue. She believes there needs to be more teeth in the existing policy so people will comply. She would like a proposed change in that policy brought to the Board either at the next meeting or the meeting after.

M. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Porter made a motion to adjourn at 3:27 p.m. Mr. Winkleman seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Arizona State Parks Board
Minutes
March 18, 2004

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

SUBMITTED BY:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director

APPROVED BY:

Elizabeth Stewart, Vice Chairman